

To: Daguiard, Robert[Daguiard.Robert@epa.gov]
From: Christopher Kirkland
Sent: Thur 8/13/2015 3:33:32 PM
Subject: Question regarding intentional pollution to justify funding

Robert,

Wow - I didn't know how else to address the subject line, but there it is. The article can be found here:

<http://www.zerohedge.com/news/2015-08-12/did-epa-intentionally-poison-animas-river-secure-superfund-money>

FYI, we have contacted the newspaper, and they said the story and it's timing are legitimate. Mark Esper wrote it, and is the editor of the paper.

Our questions are thus:

How much money does EPA estimate it will have to use to clean up their own mess?

Would EPA agree that Superfund money is the only way to fix this spill?

How many jobs will that sustain/provide for EPA?

And most importantly:

Why was the council and opinion of Mr. Esper and others not heeded? Why did EPA proceed with the plugging despite these expert opinions as to the effect? What expert opinions concluded such an outcome would NOT happen? Or in other words

Regards,

Chris Kirkland